



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/647,210	08/26/2003	Brian Scott Hallisey	200206455-1	1934
22879	7590	11/03/2008		
HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400			EXAMINER AUGUSTINE, NICHOLAS	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2179	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/03/2008	ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

JERRY.SHORMA@HP.COM

mkraft@hp.com

ipa.mail@hp.com

# Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/647,210

**Applicant(s)**

HALLISEY ET AL.

**Examiner**

NICHOLAS AUGUSTINE

**Art Unit**

2179

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 July 2008.  
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.  
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 and 5-25 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 and 5-25 is/are rejected.  
7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/5508)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_  
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_  
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application  
6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### DETAILED ACTION

- A. This action is in response to the following communications: Amendment filed: 7/28/2008. This action is made **Final**.
- B. Claims 1-3 and 5-25 remain pending.

---

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claim 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Uthe, Robert Thomas (Pub. No. US 2004/0212616 A1), herein referred to as "Uthe".

As for independent claim 18, Uthe teaches a method of displaying relationships amongst first, second and third types of resources of a system (figures 1, items 110 and 140; par.10 and 16), the method comprising: preparing a graphic of at least two separate but overlapping hierarchies such that viewing the graphic in a first direction represents a first one of said separate but overlapping hierarchies in which ones of the

first resource type report hierarchically to ones of the second resource type (par.19) the subsystems report hierarchically to the subsystems of the second resource type (par.17 and 19), and viewing the graphic in a second direction different from the first direction represents a second one of said separate but overlapping hierarchies in which ones of the first resource type report hierarchically to ones of the third resource type (par.21)and displaying the graphic (figure 1).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to

consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

5. Claims 1-3 and 5-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Uthe in view of Kanevsky et al (US 6,426,761 B1).

As for independent claim 1, Uthe teaches a method of using a Graphical User Interface (GUI) to display relationships amongst resources of a system, the method comprising: illustrating at least two overlapping but separate hierarchies in the same mosaic-like graphic (figure 1; par.18), each hierarchy representing one or more of the relationships amongst the resources (figure 2; par.19).

Uthe does not specifically teach arranging said resources representing same type of resources into columns, wherein adjacent columns group different resources, and a row intersecting adjacent columns indicates relationships between particular resources of the respective column, however in the same field of endeavor Kanevsky does (col.4, lines 33-57,66-67; col.5, lines 1-6). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Kanevsky into the teachings of Uthe to create the organizational structure as described above, this is true because Kanevsky's invention teaches the method and apparatus for generating graphical user interfaces for a variety of browser applications that organize icons, text, windows, etc into any arrangement best fit by the end user or manufacture default setting therein (col.3, lines 39-43), thus presenting an immediate relation to the

teachings of Uthe's organization of icons/nodes of a hierarchy that show the relation of resources of a hierarchy, the end result is having a system that the user navigates through an organized structure that dynamically changes throughout time by certain criteria in the system featuring overlapping separate hierarchies presented in the same graphical manner/style.

As for claim 2, Uthe further teaches wherein said resources are represented by icons and at least one resource occupies a rank in at least two of said overlapping but separate hierarchies (figures 4-5, wherein figure 4 shows a plurality of icons selectable by the user representing various information sources from various resources on a system) Uthe does not specifically mention that an icon can change size by system or user, however in the same field of endeavor Kanevsky teaches further comprising: sizing said icons in proportion to said at least one attribute of said represented resource (col.4, lines 14, 31, 38, 44,-46 and 51). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Kanevsky into the teachings of Uthe to create the organizational structure as described above, this is true because Kanevsky's invention teaches the method and apparatus for generating graphical user interfaces for a variety of browser applications that organize icons, text, windows, etc into any arrangement best fit by the end user or manufacture default setting therein (col.3, lines 39-43), thus presenting an immediate relation to the teachings of Uthe's organization of icons/nodes of a hierarchy that show the relation of

resources of a hierarchy, the end result is having a system that the user navigates through an organized structure that dynamically changes throughout time by certain criteria in the system featuring overlapping separate hierarchies presented in the same graphical manner/style.

As for claim 3, Uthe further teaches wherein said at least one attribute is storage capacity (col.4, line 45).

As for claim 4, Uthe does not specifically teach the arrangement of items in columns and rows however in the same field of endeavor as explained above Kanevsky does teach arranging said icons representing same type of resources into columns, wherein adjacent columns group different resources, and a row intersecting adjacent columns indicate relationships between particular resources of the respective column (column 5, lines 2-6; in such that the items presented to the user can be organized in "cube" like structure thus providing rows and columns; col.6, lines 1-17; which begins to talk about the fractal dimension of items presented to the user for navigation of the system); labeling said one of hierarchical columns and hierarchical rows with an indication of said at least one common feature (col.6, line 32; text representation of items; Uthe also depicts in figure 5 the user of text with the icon for explanation of what the icon represents)). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Kanevsky into the teachings of Uthe to

create the organizational structure as described above, this is true because Kanevsky's invention teaches the method and apparatus for generating graphical user interfaces for a variety of browser applications that organize icons, text, windows, etc into any arrangement best fit by the end user or manufacture default setting therein (col.3, lines 39-43), thus presenting an immediate relation to the teachings of Uthe's organization of icons/nodes of a hierarchy that show the relation of resources of a hierarchy, the end result is having a system that the user navigates through an organized structure that dynamically changes throughout time by certain criteria in the system featuring overlapping separate hierarchies presented in the same graphical manner/style.

As for claim 5, Uthe does not specifically teach the arrangement of items in columns and rows however in the same field of endeavor as explained above Kanevsky does teach arranging said icons representing same type of resources into columns, wherein adjacent columns group different resources, and a row intersecting adjacent columns indicate relationships between particular resources of the respective column (column 5, lines 2-6; in such that the items presented to the user can be organized in "cube" like structure thus providing rows and columns; col.6, lines 1-17; which begins to talk about the fractal dimension of items presented to the user for navigation of the system); labeling said one of hierarchical columns and hierarchical rows with an indication of said at least one common feature (col.6, line 32; text representation of items; Uthe also depicts in figure 5 the user of text with the icon for explanation of what the icon represents)). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the



time of the invention to combine the teachings of Kanevsky into the teachings of Uthe to create the organizational structure as described above, this is true because Kanevsky's invention teaches the method and apparatus for generating graphical user interfaces for a variety of browser applications that organize icons, text, windows, etc into any arrangement best fit by the end user or manufacture default setting therein (col.3, lines 39-43), thus presenting an immediate relation to the teachings of Uthe's organization of icons/nodes of a hierarchy that show the relation of resources of a hierarchy, the end result is having a system that the user navigates through an organized structure that dynamically changes throughout time by certain criteria in the system featuring overlapping separate hierarchies presented in the same graphical manner/style.

As for claim 6, Uthe further teaches wherein said interaction results in a change in said at least one attribute of said represented resource (user interaction with the system will cause for icons to be displayed in the nature sought by end user or default manufacture as respected realized (col.4, line 15). in response to said interaction, restructuring said first mosaic-like pane by at least re-sizing said icons proportional to a change in said at least one attribute of said represented resources (col.4, lines 14-15, 34, 45 and 51; wherein icons are changed dynamically changing criteria and explained further on a criteria can be the size of the document, size being that of in memory hence footprint).

As for claim 7, Uthe further teaches receiving an indication that one of said icons was chosen from said first mosaic like pane (figure 1; par.18); displaying attributes of said represented resource (col.6, line 7); and receiving changes to said attributes (col.5, line 66 and col.6, line 25);

As for claim 8, Uthe further teaches illustrating said attributes in a pop-up window(col.5, line 66).

As for claim 9, Uthe further teaches receiving a user indication through a peripheral device (col.5, line 66).

As for claim 10, Uthe further teaches receiving an indication of a new relationship developed between a resource of the type represented in said second mosaic-like pane and the resources represented in said first mosaic-like pane (col.5, line 66 and col.4, line 14); and restructuring, in response to receiving said indication (col.6, line 7), said at least two overlapping but separate hierarchies and corresponding said first mosaic-like pane by at least re-sizing said icons proportional to a change in said at least one attribute of said represented resources (col.5, lines 1-5 (organizational structure) and col.4, lines 14, 31, 38, 44,-46 and 51), compared to a footprint of said at least one attribute prior to receiving said indication (col.6, lines 34-37).

As for claim 11, Uthe further teaches processing a drag-and-drop of at least one said independent icon from said second mosaic-like pane to said first mosaic-like pane (col.6, line 24).

As for claim 12, Uthe further teaches rejecting said processing of an invalid said drag-and-drop(col.6, line 35).

As for claim 13, Uthe further teaches displaying a pop-up window for receiving changes to said attributes (col.5, line 66).

As for independent claim 14, Uthe teaches a method of controlling the relationships amongst resources of a system, wherein said resources are iconically represented and illustrated on a Graphical User Interface (GUI), comprising: manipulating a relationship of resources in said iconically illustrated system; and re-sizing areas of, in response to said manipulating, the relative footprints of said icons according to an effect upon the corresponding resources, respectively, caused by the relationship manipulation.

Uthe does not specifically teach wherein the relationship of the resources are shown in a hierarchical tree from placement of icons in columns with resources of a same type being in a same column, however in the same field of endeavor Kanevsky does (col.4, lines 33-57,66-67; col.5, lines 1-6). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Kanevsky into the

teachings of Uthe to create the organizational structure as described above, this is true because Kanevsky's invention teaches the method and apparatus for generating graphical user interfaces for a variety of browser applications that organize icons, text, windows, etc into any arrangement best fit by the end user or manufacture default setting therein (col.3, lines 39-43), thus presenting an immediate relation to the teachings of Uthe's organization of icons/nodes of a hierarchy that show the relation of resources of a hierarchy, the end result is having a system that the user navigates through an organized structure that dynamically changes throughout time by certain criteria in the system featuring overlapping separate hierarchies presented in the same graphical manner/style.

As for claim 15, Uthe further teaches interacting with at least one icon, representative of one said resource in said iconically illustrated system to initiate a change of at least one attribute of said represented resource (col.5, lines 1-5 (organizational structure) and col.4, lines 14, 31, 38, 44,-46 and 51).

As for claim 16, Uthe further teaches displaying, in response to said interaction step, attributes of said represented resource, wherein said attributes are changeable; and indicating changes to said at least one attribute receiving a user indication through a peripheral device (col.5, line 66) (col.4, lines 14-15, 34, 45 and 51; wherein icons are changed dynamically changing criteria and explained further on a criteria can be the size of the document, size being that of in memory hence footprint)

As for claim 17, Uthe further teaches illustrating said attributes in a pop-up window(col.5, line 66).

As for claim 19, Uthe teaches wherein the graphic is mosaic-like (figure 1).

As for claim 20, Uthe teaches wherein each of the first, second and third resources is represented as an iconic element of the mosaic-like graphic (figure 1; par.18-20).

As for claim 21, Uthe teaches wherein the graphic is mosaic-like (figure 1); wherein each of the first, second and third resources is represented as an iconic element of the mosaic-like graphic (par.20; figure 2). Uthe does not specifically go into detail to explain what the exact nodes represent other than what is commonly known in the art in hierarchical systems, however in the same field of endeavor Kanevsky teaches wherein the first one of said separate but overlapping hierarchies represents physical storage resources of a storage system (col.1, lines 19-24; wherein the nodes/icons presented represent a wide selection of information including data storage as suggested; col.4, lines 28-30), and the second one of said separate but overlapping hierarchies represents logical storage resources of the storage system; wherein the second direction is opposite to the first direction (col.5, lines 2-6; col.6, line 5) . It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to

combine the teachings of Kanevsky into the teachings of Uthe to create the organizational structure as described above, this is true because Kanevsky's invention teaches the method and apparatus for generating graphical user interfaces for a variety of browser applications that organize icons, text, windows, etc into any arrangement best fit by the end user or manufacture default setting therein (col.3, lines 39-43), thus presenting an immediate relation to the teachings of Uthe's organization of icons/nodes of a hierarchy that show the relation of resources of a hierarchy, the end result is having a system that the user navigates through an organized structure that dynamically changes throughout time by certain criteria in the system featuring overlapping separate hierarchies presented in the same graphical manner/style.

As for claim 22, Uthe teaches wherein the second direction is opposite to the first direction. Uthe does not specifically go into detail to explain what the exact nodes represent other than what is commonly known in the art in hierarchical systems, however in the same field of endeavor Kanevsky teaches wherein the second direction is opposite to the first direction (col.5, lines 2-6; col.6, line 5) . It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Kanevsky into the teachings of Uthe to create the organizational structure as described above, this is true because Kanevsky's invention teaches the method and apparatus for generating graphical user interfaces for a variety of browser applications that organize icons, text, windows, etc into any arrangement best fit by the end user or manufacture default setting therein (col.3, lines 39-43), thus presenting an immediate

relation to the teachings of Uthe's organization of icons/nodes of a hierarchy that show the relation of resources of a hierarchy, the end result is having a system that the user navigates through an organized structure that dynamically changes throughout time by certain criteria in the system featuring overlapping separate hierarchies presented in the same graphical manner/style.

As for claim 23, Uthe further teaches wherein said first, second and third types of resources are represented by icons (figure 1, par.18-20), further comprising: sizing said icons in proportion to at least one attribute of said represented resource. Uthe does not specifically mention that an icon can change size by system or user, however in the same field of endeavor Kanevsky teaches further comprising: sizing said icons in proportion to said at least one attribute of said represented resource (col.4, lines 14, 31, 38, 44,-46 and 51). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Kanevsky into the teachings of Uthe to create the organizational structure as described above, this is true because Kanevsky's invention teaches the method and apparatus for generating graphical user interfaces for a variety of browser applications that organize icons, text, windows, etc into any arrangement best fit by the end user or manufacture default setting therein (col.3, lines 39-43), thus presenting an immediate relation to the teachings of Uthe's organization of icons/nodes of a hierarchy that show the relation of resources of a hierarchy, the end result is having a system that the user navigates through an organized structure that

dynamically changes throughout time by certain criteria in the system featuring overlapping separate hierarchies presented in the same graphical manner/style.

As for claim 24, Uthe further teaches wherein said at least one attribute is storage capacity (col.4, line 45).

As for claim 25, Uthe does not specifically teach the arrangement of items in columns and rows however in the same field of endeavor as explained above Kanevsky does teach arranging said icons representing same type of resources into columns, wherein adjacent columns group different resources, and a row intersecting adjacent columns indicate relationships between particular resources of the respective column (column 5, lines 2-6; in such that the items presented to the user can be organized in "cube" like structure thus providing rows and columns; col.6, lines 1-17; which begins to talk about the fractal dimension of items presented to the user for navigation of the system); labeling said one of hierarchical columns and hierarchical rows with an indication of said at least one common feature (col.6, line 32; text representation of items; Uthe also depicts in figure 5 the user of text with the icon for explanation of what the icon represents)). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Kanevsky into the teachings of Uthe to create the organizational structure as described above, this is true because Kanevsky's invention teaches the method and apparatus for generating graphical user interfaces for a variety of browser applications that organize icons, text, windows, etc into any



arrangement best fit by the end user or manufacture default setting therein (col.3, lines 39-43), thus presenting an immediate relation to the teachings of Uthe's organization of icons/nodes of a hierarchy that show the relation of resources of a hierarchy, the end result is having a system that the user navigates through an organized structure that dynamically changes throughout time by certain criteria in the system featuring overlapping separate hierarchies presented in the same graphical manner/style.

---

*Uthe further teaches method of controlling the relationships amongst resources of a system (col.4, lines 54-55); manipulating a relationship of resources in said iconically illustrated system (col.4, lines 38); and re-sizing areas of, in response to said manipulating (col.4,line 43), the relative footprints of said icons according to an effect upon the corresponding resources, respectively, caused by the relationship manipulation (col.6, lines 25 and 33-40).*

---

**(Note:)** It is noted that any citation to specific, pages, columns, lines, or figures in the prior art references and any interpretation of the references should not be considered to be limiting in any way. A reference is relevant for all it contains and may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art. In re Heck, 699 F.2d 1331, 1332-33, 216 USPQ 1038, 1039 (Fed. Cir. 1983) (quoting In re Lemelson, 397 F.2d 1006,1009, 158 USPQ 275, 277 (CCPA 1968)).

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed 07/28/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

After careful review of the amended claims (given the broadest interpretation) and the remarks provided by the Applicant along with the cited reference(s) the Examiner does not agree with the Applicant for at least the reasons provided below:

A1. Applicant argues that Uthe does not teach viewing the graphic in a first direction represents a first one of said separate but overlapping hierarchies in which ones of the first resource type report hierarchically to ones of the second resource type, and viewing the graphic in a second direction different from the first direction represents a second one of said separate but overlapping hierarchies in which ones of the first resource type report hierarchically to ones of the third resource type. Uthe does not teach or suggest these elements.

R1. Examiner does not agree, Uthe shows in paragraph 19 that one node can be part of a plurality of hierarchies (multiple locations) and that each location can be viewed independently or together (par.21). Thus Uthe shows displaying a first and second resource types that are part of different visual elements "direction" based on the current claim language Uthe teaches the same functionality.

A2. Applicant argues that Kanevsky does not suggest that a relationship of resources is based on placement of icons in columns with resources of the same type being in the same column.

R2. Examiner does not agree, Kanevsky shows that the icon elements can take on any layout and that the icons that are displayed next to each other share a relationship, thus since icons that are displayed next to each other are related and icons

can take on a plurality of different layouts (structures that are organized in any way) one or ordinary skill in the art would not be hard pressed to find that Kanevsky teaches that a relationship of resources is based on placement of icons in columns with resources of the same type being in the same column (col.4, lines 33-57,66-67; col.5, lines 1-6).

### ***Conclusion***

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

### ***Inquires***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nicholas Augustine whose telephone number is 571-270-1056. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday: 7:30- 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Weilun Lo can be reached on 571-272-4847. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Nicholas Augustine/  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2179  
October 23, 2008

/Ba Huynh/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2179